

30th October 1931]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think the motion is in order. Does any hon. Member object to it?"

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I do not object to the motion. I request that it may be taken up for consideration to-morrow."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The motion will be taken up to-morrow at 4 p.m."

V.—ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

The hon. the President announced that the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments (Amendment) Act, 1931, received the assent of His Excellency the Governor-General on the 29th September 1931.

VI.—ACTS ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

The hon. the President announced that the undermentioned Acts received the assent of His Excellency the Governor on the dates mentioned against each:—

1. The Madras District Municipalities (Amendment) Act, 1931 ... 5th August 1931.
2. The Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1931 ... 5th August 1931.
3. The Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Act, 1931 ... 31st August 1931.
4. The Gudalur Compensation for Tenants Improvements Act, 1931. 5th September 1931.
5. The Madras Hindu Religious Endowments (Amendment) Act, 1931 ... 7th September 1931.

VII.—AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDER 21 OF THE MADRAS
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

* The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider a draft amendment to Standing Order 21 and move that the report be taken into consideration."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I beg to move that the amendment be passed."

[Sir Mahomed Usman] [30th October 1931]

“ Standing Order 21, as amended by the Select Committee, reads thus:

‘ 21. *If the President is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, he shall read the statement to the Council and ask whether the member has the leave of the Council. If objection is taken, the President shall request those members who support the motion to rise in their places, and if twenty or more members rise accordingly, the President shall intimate that the motion will be taken at 4 p.m. the same day. If less than twenty members rise, the President shall inform the member that he has not the leave of the Council.*’ ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ I second it.”

The amendment was put and carried.

VIII.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS PREVENTION OF ADULTERATION ACT, 1918.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“ Sir, I beg to introduce a Bill^a to amend the Madras Prevention of Adulteration Act, 1918 (Bill No. 23 of 1931) and move that the Bill be taken into consideration.”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“ I second it.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ The motion is that Bill No. 23 of 1931 be taken into consideration.”

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—“ Sir, I am sorry I have not given notice of an amendment that the Bill may be referred to a select committee. But having regard to the fact that the rules, as at present framed, do not suit the local requirements, I appeal to the honourable Minister to see whether it is not advisable to have all the rules scrutinised and amended in such a way that they suit the local conditions. Let me cite one or two examples to show how even in the case of persons who want to conform strictly to the provisions of the Act, the rules work very great hardship. The Corporation of Madras prosecuted certain ghee merchants. Mr. Smith knows those cases. The merchants were prosecuted because they did not put up labels showing the proportion of the various ingredients composing the sample of ghee. The rules required that they should put up such labels for every tin of ghee offered for sale. That means that they should send their samples to the Public Analyst or the Corporation Analyst and take his report of the analysis of the samples and only then sell their ghee clearly showing the proportion of the various ingredients in it. The merchants submitted that

^a Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 20th October 1931.